

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1, 5-7 and 11-16 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 7, and 13 are independent. In the Final Office Action dated October 30, 2007, Claims 1, 5-7, and 11-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Following this response, Claims 1, 5-7, and 11-16 remain in this application. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

I. Interview Summary

Applicants thank Examiner Godbold for the courtesy of a telephone interview on December 3, 2007, requested by the undersigned to discuss the rejection of the current claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103. During the interview, Applicants asserted that the cited references neither anticipate nor render obvious the claims as amended. The Examiner requested that Applicants clarify the arguments differentiating the claims from "The Bi-Directional Algorithm" ("*Davis*") reference, which Applicants have done. No agreement was reached regarding patentability.

II. Rejection of Claims 1, 5-7, and 11-12 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Final Office Action dated October 30, 2007, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 5-7, and 11-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2004/0039996 ("*Flam*") in view of *Davis*. Claims 1 and 7 have been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

Amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "evaluating successively, by the computer system, a plurality of characters comprising the mixed language text message to determine whether ones of the plurality of characters comprise one of the following: a strong character and a weak character, wherein the strong character comprises at least one alphabetic character and the weak character comprises at least one non-alphabetic character." Amended Claim 7 includes a similar recitation. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification at least on page 11, lines 20-24.

In contrast, *Flam* at least does not teach or suggest the aforementioned recitation. For example, *Flam* discloses selecting text using a pointing device so that an applet restores characters to their appropriate form and order. (See *Flam*, para. [0015].) In *Flam*, a mouse is used to select a "switch" button that reverses the Hebrew letters' order while Latin characters in a window are not reversed. (See *Flam*, para. [0062].) After the button has been selected, each new keystroke causes a corresponding character to be displayed to the left of a last line appearing in the window. (See *Flam*, para. [0057].) In *Flam*, a message's characters are not evaluated in turn to look for a strong, alphabetic character. Rather *Flam* merely discloses a button for selecting an order in which text should be displayed.

Furthermore, *Davis* does not overcome *Flam*'s deficiencies. *Davis* merely discloses ordering codes to signal text directional formatting. (See *Davis*, page 5.) These codes are designed to be equivalently represented by out-of-line information, such as stylesheet information. (See *Davis*, page 6.) *Davis* further discloses light-weight codes that do not display or have any other semantic effect. (See *Davis*, page

7.) *Davis* further discloses that systems conforming to *Davis'* standard fall into three categories: no visual interpretation of characters from right-to-left scripts, implementing an implicit bidirectional algorithm and support for directional marks RLM and LRM, or implementing an implicit bidirectional algorithm with support for the implicit directional marks and explicit directional embedding codes. In *Davis*, a message's characters are not evaluated in turn to look only for a strong, alphabetic character. Rather, *Davis* merely discloses requiring out-of-line stylesheet information or non-visible codes to signal text directional formatting if any bidirectional formatting is to be achieved.

Combining *Flam* with *Davis* would not have led to the claimed invention because *Flam* and *Davis*, either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose or suggest "evaluating successively, by the computer system, a plurality of characters comprising the mixed language text message to determine whether ones of the plurality of characters comprise one of the following: a strong character and a weak character, wherein the strong character comprises at least one alphabetic character and the weak character comprises at least one non-alphabetic character," as recited by amended Claim 1. Claim 7 includes a similar recitation. Accordingly, independent Claims 1 and 7 each patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 1 and 7.

Dependent Claims 5-6 and 11-12 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 1 and 7, and by virtue of their respective dependencies upon independent Claims 1 and 7. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 5-6 and 11-12.

III. Rejection of Claims 13-16 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 13-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Flam* in view of U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2002/0143825 ("*Fienberg*") and further in view of *Davis*. Claim 13 has been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

Amended Claim 13 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "examining characters of a sentence of a mixed language text message in succession in an attempt to locate at least one strong character, wherein the at least one strong character comprises an alphabetic character." Support for this amendment can be found in the specification at least on page 11, lines 20-24.

In contrast, *Flam* at least does not teach or suggest the aforementioned recitation. For example, *Flam* discloses selecting text using a pointing device so that an applet restores characters to their appropriate form and order. (See *Flam*, para. [0015].) In *Flam*, a mouse is used to select a "switch" button that reverses the Hebrew letters' order while Latin characters in a window are not reversed. (See *Flam*, para. [0062].) After the button has been selected, each new keystroke causes a corresponding character to be displayed to the left of a last line appearing in the window. (See *Flam*, para. [0057].) In *Flam*, a message's characters are not evaluated in turn to look for a strong, alphabetic character. Rather *Flam* merely discloses a button for selecting an order in which text should be displayed.

Furthermore, *Fienberg* does not overcome *Flam*'s deficiencies. *Fienberg* merely discloses, with respect to text rendered according to Hebrew language rules, a module that scans every character looking for a dash. (See *Fienberg*, para. [0032].) When a module in *Fienberg* locates a dash, text including the dash is highlighted and a user is given a prompt to ask whether the text surrounding the dash should be reversed or flipped into a left-to-right configuration. (See *Fienberg*, para. [0032].) Like *Flam*, in *Fienberg* the characters of the message are not evaluated in turn to look for a strong, alphabetic character. Rather *Fienberg* merely discloses that when a dash is discovered, text including the dash is highlighted and the user is given a prompt to ask whether the text surrounding the dash should be reversed.

Also, *Davis* does not overcome *Flam*'s deficiencies. *Davis* merely discloses ordering codes to signal text directional formatting. (See *Davis*, page 5.) These codes are designed to be equivalently represented by out-of-line information, such as stylesheet information. (See *Davis*, page 6.) *Davis* further discloses light-weight codes that do not display or have any other semantic effect. (See *Davis*, page 7.) In *Davis*, a message's characters are not evaluated in turn to look for a strong, alphabetic character. Rather, *Davis* merely discloses using out-of-line stylesheet information or non-visible codes to signal text directional formatting.

Combining *Flam* and *Fienberg* with *Davis* would not have led to the claimed invention because *Flam*, *Fienberg* and *Davis*, either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose or suggest "evaluating successively, by the computer system, a plurality of characters comprising the mixed language text message to determine whether ones of the plurality of characters comprise one of the following: a strong

character and a weak character, wherein the strong character comprises at least one alphabetic character and the weak character comprises at least one non-alphabetic character," as recited by amended Claim 13. Accordingly, independent Claim 13 patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claim 13.

Dependent Claims 14-16 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claim 13, and by virtue of their dependency upon independent Claim 13. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 14-16.

IV. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request that this Amendment After Final be entered by the Examiner, placing the claims in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully submit that the proposed amendments of the claims do not raise new issues or necessitate the undertaking of any additional search of the art by the Examiner, since all of the elements and their relationships claimed were either earlier claimed or inherent in the claims as examined. Therefore, this Amendment should allow for immediate action by the Examiner.

Finally, Applicants respectfully submit that the entry of the Amendment would place the application in better form for appeal, should the Examiner dispute the patentability of the pending claims.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention, as amended, is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the prior

art references cited against this application. Applicants therefore request the entry of this Amendment, the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims, as amended, are patentable over the cited references. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Official Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Official Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Final Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Final Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this amendment and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account No. 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
404.954.5066

/D. Kent Stier/

Date: December 31, 2007

D. Kent Stier
Reg. No. 50,640

DKS:bjr/mdc

